

CONFERENCE ON NEW ENGLAND ARCHAEOLOGY

MITCHELL MULHOLLAND (Editor) UMASS Archaeological Services University of Massachusetts Blaisdell House Amherst, MA 01003

Dena Dincauze University of Massachusetts Anthropology Department Amherst MA 01003

CNEA STEERING COMMITTEE -- 1988-1990

TERM EXPIRES 1990:

BARBARA LUEDTKE (Chair) Department of Anthropology University of Massachusetts Harbor Campus Boston, MA 02125 (617) 929-8150 STEPHEN A. MROZOWSKI Department of Anthropology University of Massachusetts Harbor Campus Boston, MA 02125 (617) 929-8150

TERM EXPIRES 1989:

JOHN CROSS (Editorial Committee) Department of Anthropology University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003 413-774-5070

JAMES PETERSEN

Dept. of Social Science and Business University of Maine at Farmington Farmington, ME 04938 (207) 778-3501 BRONA SIMON Massachusetts Historical Commission Boylston Street Boston, MA 02116 617-727-8470

MITCHELL MULHOLLAND (Editor)

UMASS Archaeological Services

University of Massachusetts

Blaisdell House

413-548-9161

Amherst, MA 01003

TREASURER AND MEMBERSHIP: CONFERENCE:

DEBORAH COX Public Archaeology Laboratory, Inc. 387 Lonsdale Avenue Pawtucket, RI 02860 401-728-8780 DAVID SIMMONS Old Sturbridge Village Sturbridge, MA 01566 617-347-3362

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

JOHN RICE COLE Water Resources Research Center Blaisdell House University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003 413-545-2842 DOROTHY SCHLOTTHAUER KRASS Department of Anthropology University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003 413-545-1552

Cover: Electrical Resistivity plot of the Hassenemisco Native American Burying Ground.

New England Archaeology NEWSLETTER

CONTENTS

Conference on

Contributed paper - Brona Simon and Valerie Talmage	Meeting announcement - CNEA 1989
Current Research by Topic.13Ramah Chert Artifacts and Debitage from Sites in New England.13Paleoindian Studies.14Paleoenvironmental Studies - Archaic Period.14Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Late Woodland.15Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Iroquois.16Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Upland Interior.16Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Upland Riverine Areas.17Prehistoric Settlement in the Berkshire Uplands.19Historic and Prehistoric Settlement: Upland Marginal Areas.20Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Lowland Riverine Environments.21Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Coastal Zone.21Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Coastal and Island Areas.22Historic Archaeological Research: Nantucket.24Cultural Resource Management: New Hampshire.24	Contributed paper - Brona Simon and Valerie Talmage2
Ramah Chert Artifacts and Debitage from Sites in New England	Current Research by Topic
Paleoindian Studies.14Paleoenvironmental Studies - Archaic Period.14Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Late Woodland.15Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Iroquois.16Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Upland Interior.16Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Upland Riverine Areas.17Prehistoric Settlement in the Berkshire Uplands.19Historic and Prehistoric Settlement: Upland Marginal Areas.20Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Lowland Riverine Environments.21Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Coastal Zone.21Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Coastal and Island Areas.22Historic Archaeological Research: Nantucket.24Cultural Resource Management: New Hampshire.24	Ramah Chert Artifacts and Debitage from Sites in New England
Paleoenvironmental Studies - Archaic Period	Paleoindian Studies14
Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Late Woodland	Paleoenvironmental Studies - Archaic Period
Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Iroquois	Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Late Woodland
Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Upland Interior	Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Iroquois
Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Upland Riverine Areas	Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Upland Interior
Prehistoric Settlement in the Berkshire Uplands	Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Upland Riverine Areas
Historic and Prehistoric Settlement: Upland Marginal Areas	Prehistoric Settlement in the Berkshire Uplands
Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Lowland Riverine Environments	Historic and Prehistoric Settlement: Upland Marginal Areas
Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Coastal Zone	Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Lowland Riverine Environments
Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Coastal and Island Areas	Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Coastal Zone
Historic Archaeological Research: Nantucket	Prehistoric Settlement Patterns: Coastal and Island Areas
Cultural Resource Management: New Hampshire	Historic Archaeological Research: Nantucket
	Cultural Resource Management: New Hampshire
Field Schools	Field Schools
New Publications and Reports	New Publications and Reports
Treasurer's Report	Treasurer's Report

Vol. 8, No. 2 April 1989

CONFERENCE ON NEW ENGLAND ARCHAEOLOGY

1989 ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM

HUMAN BURIALS

Conference Center Meeting Hall

Old Sturbridge Village

Sturbridge, Massachusetts

Saturday, May 20, 1989

The 1989 meeting of the Conference on New England Archaeology will be held at the meeting hall at Old Sturbridge Village. The program will be as follows:

9:00-9:30 Registration (Coffee and muffins)

9:30-12:00 Presentations:

RICARDO ELIA (Office of Public Archaeology - Boston University) The Uxbridge Almshouse Burial Ground: Discovery, Excavation, and Implications for the Treatment of Abandoned Historical Cemeteries.

KEVIN MCBRIDE (University of Connecticut) Recent Investigations at the West Ferry Site: Seventeenth Century Narragansett Cemetery.

CATHERINE CARLSON (University of Massachusetts, Amherst) An Overview of Praying Indian Burials and Burial Grounds in Massachusetts.

D. RICHARD GUMAER AND MITCHELL MULHOLLAND (UMASS Archaeological Services, Amherst) Geophysical Methods: Determining the Boundaries of Unmarked Cemeteries.

JOHN KRIGBAUM (New York University) Late Woodland Biocultural Adaptation in Northwestern Vermont.

12:00-1:30 Lunch at local restaurants

1:30-1:45 Business meeting (yearly reports, elections)

1:45-2:30 Presentations:

LENORE BARBIAN and ANN MAGENNIS (University of Massachusetts, Amherst) The Bioarchaeological Interpretation of the Turner Farm Site, Maine.

DAVID LACY (U.S. Forest Service) A "Human Remains Policy": Observations from the Green Mountain National Forest, Vermont.

2:30-4:00 Workshops

2:30-3:30 1. Burial issues in New England Archaeology.

3:30-4:00 2. Discussion of the formation of an organization of providers of archaeological services in New England and its possible institutional affiliation with CNEA.

4:00-6:00 Social Hours (at a local "watering hole" to be announced)

Registration fee: \$5.00

Annual dues: \$10.00

THE STATUS OF STATE PROGRAMS PROTECTING BURIAL SITES IN NEW ENGLAND

by Brona G. Simon and Valerie A. Talmage Massachusetts Historical Commission

Archaeologists have long recognized the informational and analytical value of burials as a data source in archaeological studies, but have been slower to recognize the anthropological and moral issues surrounding the appropriate treatment of skeletal remains (Rosen 1980). Even slower has been the recognition of the need for stronger laws to protect burial sites.

The forum of debate on the treatment of burials has been at the national level, led by members of the National Park Service, the Society for American Archaeology, the National Congress of American Indians and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (e.g., Quick 1985). Yet burial laws and regulations are, except on federally owned land, the purview of the states. At this printing, more than 20 states have laws dealing with unmarked or Native American burial sites. Laws concerning burials can or do deal with several topics, including: the treatment of unmarked vs. marked burials and cemeteries, prohibitions against disturbance or excavation, penalties for disturbing a grave, provisions for archaeological investigation and analysis, and disposition of disinterred remains. Principal parties include: state or SHPO archaeologists; medical examiners; Native Americans; descendants; and other interested parties. Over ten years ago, the treatment of Indian skeletal remains by archaeologists came under scrutiny by Native American groups. In several states, Indians tried to stop archaeologists from excavating burials on archaeological sites (e.g., Talmage 1982a; Anderson et al. 1978). In California, for instance, an Indian burial law was passed which specifically excludes archaeologists from consultation with the Native councils which administer the burial program.

A few states took pioneer steps to pass comprehensive burial laws which recognized both the Native American interests in reburying the skeletal remains and the archaeologists' interest in recording and analyzing them (e.g., Idaho, Iowa, North Carolina, Maine and Massachusetts). The National Park Service developed a burial policy which was weighted heavily in favor of curation rather than reburial of skeletal remains to the dismay of Native American groups (DOI 1982). More sensitive to Indian concerns, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation adopted a policy on the treatment of human skeletal remains and artifacts in projects requiring review under Section 106, which allows for reinterment (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 1988).

Throughout the period of the national debate, the states have faced the issue within their borders, and many have held dialogues with the Native groups. Many states have passed burial laws or have implemented burial policy in consultation with Native Americans as the national debate has continued. Each state has its own legislative history and unique circumstances surrounding the composition of its government and Native American communities. For the six New England states, this paper describes those laws; and for the states without burial laws, the relevant policies.

Connecticut

Connecticut's state laws have recognized the Native Americans' interest in reburying Indian skeletal remains since 1981, when statutes were passed requiring any discoveries of Indian burials to be reported and all remains transferred to the Connecticut Indian Affairs Council for reburial (Connecticut General Statute Section 47-66e and 66f). Current state laws do not provide for archaeological study, analysis or funding (Poirier et al. 1985). However, a bill which would address these issues is presently before the state legislature.

In practice, the Connecticut SHPO office, the State Archaeologist, the Connecticut Indian Affairs Council, the state Department of Environmental Protection, and the Office of the State Medical Examiner coordinate their efforts in cases of accidental discovery of historic or prehistoric burials. Burials are encountered between two to five times a year (Dave Poirier, personal communication). The medical examiner is notified of such discoveries, even if they are made during an archaeological investigation; then the State Archaeologist and SHPO archaeologist are notified. The preferred treatment is to preserve the burials in situ. If the burials are threatened, they may be removed through an archaeological excavation and subjected to physical analysis. The Indian Affairs Council, and in some cases the local Indian tribe, consult for transference of the skeletal remains and artifacts if the burial has been excavated.

As a result of a study by Connecticut's Legislative Task Force on Indian Affairs, a comprehensive bill has been drafted and introduced in this year's General Assembly. Titled the "Native American Heritage and Archaeological Preservation Act," the bill includes provisions and procedures concerning: (1) the treatment of Indian burials and sacred sites, and disposition of Indian skeletal remains and grave goods; and (2) the issuance of archaeological permits by the Connecticut SHPO for the conduct of archaeological investigations on state lands or state archaeological preserves.

The proposed legislation would emphasize the preservation and protection of Indian burial sites and would establish an orderly notification system. The State Archaeologist would be charged with investigating discoveries of burials and consulting with property owners and the Indian Council. If the burial cannot be preserved in situ, there are provisions for its removal and analysis by the State Archaeologist. The bill allows for the reburial of Indian skeletal remains which are found after the act takes effect.

Maine

In 1973 the Maine legislature passed the "Indian Bones" law (Chapter 22, Section 4732) which requires that all Indian skeletal remains discovered after 1973 be transferred to appropriate Indian tribes for reburial. The law allows for the anthropological or archaeological study of the remains to be completed within one year of the initial discovery. Artifacts or "sacred objects" are not referenced in the statute, and are thus not required to be reburied. There are no statutory provisions for the funding of the scientific analysis and no criminal penalties for failing to comply.

In implementing this law, the Maine State Museum is currently in the process of analyzing skeletal collections acquired since 1973 for transfer to the tribes (Arthur Spiess, personal communication). Both the Maine Historic Preservation Commission and the State Museum have a good working relationship with the Maine Indian tribes, which include the Passamaquoddy, Penobscot, Micmac and Maliseet. Through dialogue and cooperation, both archaeological and native interests are recognized in Maine's archaeological programs.

Although no Maine statute specifies procedures concerning the new discoveries of unmarked burials, in practice, procedures similar to those required by law in Massachusetts and New Hampshire are followed. When skeletal remains are encountered, whether during an archaeological excavation or other earth-disturbing activity, the state coroner and -- if the discovery is of archaeological concern, the archaeologists at the SHPO or State Museum, or both -- are notified. The preferred treatment is to preserve the burial in situ, but if preservation is not possible, the remains are excavated and the "Indian Bones" law is followed.

In a recent interview Arthur Spiess, archaeologist at the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, indicated that the majority of well-preserved burials in Maine are located in shell middens along the coast, where the coastal zone ordinances control development and help to protect these sites. In general, however, Maine has had few discoveries of burials. Last year, Spiess reports, three discoveries were made: two during archaeological investigations, where the burials were preserved in place after being photographed and examined in the field; and one in a case where the burial was eroding out of a river bank and had to be removed.

Massachusetts

The Massachusetts Unmarked Burial Law was passed as Chapter 659 of the Acts of 1983. It formalized into law administrative procedures which had been in effect since 1979

(Talmage 1982a, 1982b). The principal state officials involved in the treatment of human skeletal remains were given clear responsibilities and duties, and unmarked burials of any cultural affiliation were given protection under the law (M.G.L., Ch. 9, ss.26S and 27C; Ch. 38, ss.6B-6C; Ch. 7, s.38A; Ch. 114, s.17).

The Medical Examiner is the principal state agent who initially investigates discoveries of human remains and determines whether they are recent or more than one hundred years old. If they are recent, there might be a police investigation; but if the remains are more than a hundred years old, the Medical Examiner then notifies the State Archaeologist.

Under the Massachusetts burial law, the State Archaeologist is charged with investigating the sites of accidental discoveries of burials which are more than one hundred years old. The law requires that all ground disturbance activities cease until the site is investigated and the treatment of the site is decided. Police authorities may secure the site during the entire investigation. Any willful destruction of a burial or grave is a criminal offense (felony) under state law.

If the remains are known or expected to be Native American, the State Archaeologist notifies and consults with the Commission on Indian Affairs. Indian Affairs is the agency of the state government which oversees matters concerning Native American Indians within Massachusetts. It is comprised of members of the indigenous Native groups of Massachusetts, such as the Wampanoag, Nipmuck and Narragansett; and representatives of nonindigenous, relocated Indians now residing in the state, such as Micmac, Sioux and Navajo.

When the State Archaeologist conducts an investigation of an Indian burial site, Indian Affairs may send a representative to monitor the work in order to insure that it is being conducted in a respectful manner. The State Archaeologist and Indian Affairs officials consult with the landowners to determine whether burials can be protected. Indian Affairs officials and the State Archaeologist also discuss together how the remains shall be treated, including the types of analyses to be performed and the ultimate disposition of the remains.

In cases where it is impossible to preserve burials in place or avoid future impacts to burials, the State Archaeologist, or an archaeologist under a special permit from the State, excavates and removes the remains.

Skeletal remains are analyzed by a physical anthropologist in accordance with standardized Guidelines for the Analysis of Human Skeletal Remains published by the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC n.d.). A complete series of osteometric measurements is taken for all remains; morphological characteristics and pathologies are described; full sets of x-rays and photographs are taken; and plaster casts are made of the teeth. Through consultation on a case-by-case basis, Indian Affairs has also agreed to radiocarbon dating, isotope analysis and the maintenance of small samples of bone. It is only after the analysis of the skeletal remains is complete that the State Archaeologist transfers the remains to Indian Affairs for disposition. The analysis must be completed within one year of excavation, unless further consultation allows for a longer period. The unmarked burial law does not require that artifacts be transferred to Indian Affairs for disposition.

The disposition policy of the Commission on Indian Affairs is the reburial of skeletal remains. Indian Affairs' reburial standards call for the reburial of remains in a protected location as near to the original burial site as possible. Archaeological context and anthropological associations are considered in the reburial arrangement, and Indian Affairs keeps a record of the reburials and their locations.

If the remains are not Native American, the State Archaeologist arranges for their curation in a curatorial facility.

Since 1983 an average of ten burial discoveries have been reported each year. In 1988 two Praying Indian cemeteries were discovered during construction projects: as a result, it is estimated that more than 250 burials were included in the ten discoveries reported.

During the period between 1985 and 1988, the MHC was notified of threats to 29 burial sites. In only seven of these cases were impacts unavoidable, thus requiring excavation; the remaining 22 sites were preserved in situ (Simon 1988). Thus, in 76% of the cases, the implementation of the Unmarked Burial Law was successful in preserving and protecting burial sites.

New Hampshire

Several chapters of the Revised Statutes Annotated (RSA) of New Hampshire have been passed to establish protection for marked and unmarked graves and cemeteries; to provide for archaeological investigation and analysis of unmarked burials which are accidentally discovered; to prohibit excavation of burials without a permit; to allow for consultation with interested or related parties in the disposition of excavated skeletal remains; to establish procedures to follow when burials are disturbed; and to impose criminal penalties for violation of the burial laws (RSA Chapter 227-C: 1-a; Chapter 227-C: 8a-8g; Chapter 289; Chapter 290; Chapter 635: 6-8). New Hampshire's burial statutes (along with those of Massachusetts) are among the most comprehensive in the New England states.

When human remains are found accidentally, all excavation must cease and the local police must be notified. The police contact the medical examiner who determines whether the remains require a criminal or an archaeological investigation.

If an archaeological investigation is indicated, the State Archaeologist arranges with the landowner for removal of the remains. The State Archaeologist also has the responsibility to consult with individuals who have an interest in the remains (descendants, appropriate Native American groups, etc.). These groups have the right to determine the ultimate disposition of the remains. An exemption to this determination exists for over-riding scientific or cultural concerns and when no clear claimants exist.

Since the law took effect in 1987 only one discovery has been reported (Gary Hume, personal communication). However, the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources has successfully used the statute to advocate that developers conduct surveys (rather than

get caught with the unexpected discoveries).

The Division of Historical Resources is working with the New Hampshire Attorney General to consider increasing the penalty for destruction of human remains from a misdemeanor to a felony.

Rhode Island

Rhode Island statutes protect known cemeteries and prohibit the desecration of graves (Statute 23-18). The unauthorized removal of dead bodies is a felony under Rhode Island criminal statute (11-44-31), with penalties of up to three years imprisonment or a \$500 fine, or both.

When human skeletal remains are accidentally discovered, Rhode Island statutes require that the police and medical examiner be notified. The Rhode Island medical examiner currently has an agreement with the Department of Anthropology at University of Rhode Island, which provides forensic services to the medical examiner. If URI's chief physical anthropologist identifies the remains as those of Native Americans, he notifies the State Archaeologist at the Rhode Island Historic Preservation Commission (RIHPC), who then notifies the Narragansett tribal officials and begins consultation concerning the treatment of the remains. On the average, Indian burials are discovered about three times a year (Paul Robinson, personal communication).

Since Rhode Island laws do not explicitly protect unmarked or isolated burials and do not include provisions for archaeological investigation or analysis, the RIHPC relies on persuasion and negotiation when burial sites are threatened. In the most well-known burial case, RI 1000, the RIHPC successfully negotiated with the landowner and Native American groups to allow for the careful excavation and scientific analysis of this 17th century Indian burial ground (Robinson and Gustafson 1982). Through the negotiations, the Narragansett Tribe asserted ownership of the skeletal remains and artifacts from the site and asked that they be transferred to the tribe for disposition. The archaeological and physical analysis is still in progress.

The RIHPC has adopted guidelines for Indian participation in archaeological surveys (RIHPC 1988). Broadly applicable to archaeological site investigations rather than simply burial sites, RIHPC's guidelines acknowledge the need to recognize the Native Americans' interest in sites relating to their own history. The guidelines recommend that archaeologists coordinate their investigations with the Narragansett Indian Archaeological-Anthropological Committee.

The RIHPC recognizes the need to strengthen Rhode Island's burial statutes. Currently, factionalization within the Narragansett tribe make consultation and agreement difficult.

Vermont

,

Vermont has no state laws or regulations specifically relating to unmarked burials, accidental discoveries of burials or the treatment and disposition of skeletal remains. Vermont does have several statutes which protect marked cemeteries and prohibit the unauthorized excavation of "dead bodies" or remains (13 V.S.A. Chapter 81 Subchapter 3; 18 V.S.A. Chapter 121, 13 V.S.A. Chapter 107). The penalty for unlawful exhumation of burials is a maximum sentence of 15 years imprisonment or a fine not to exceed \$2,000, or both. Until recently, these laws had not been tested for their application to unmarked pre-historic Indian burials. However, in 1988 Vermont strenuously and successfully applied these criminal codes to a case in which a site containing multiple Indian burials was threat-ened by the construction of a residential development (Daniel Cassedy, personal communication).

This case involved a private residential development which was proposed on a parcel of land on the Missisquoi River which contained an archaeological site recorded in Vermont's inventory. During construction, burials were encountered and investigated by an archaeologist from the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation (VDHP). Since evidence of multiple burials was discovered, the VDHP agreed that the site met the statutory definition of a cemetery and sought intervention by the state's Attorney General. The Attorney General agreed with VDHP and requested that the Superior Court issue a temporary restraining order on the construction. The Court granted the order, prohibiting construction activities from continuing. The VDHP consulted with the property owner who agreed to sell the lots containing the burial site (about 1 acre in size). The Nature Conservancy, was willing to purchase the site, since the VDHP did not have the funds available at the time. The VDHP has since asked the Legislature for funds to purchase the site from the Nature Conservancy.

The application of Vermont's cemetery laws to this case required considerable effort on the part of the VDHP, the Attorney General's office and the courts (Daniel Cassedy, personal communication). VDHP currently has no confident statistics on the number of burials which are accidentally encountered in the state, since there is no legal requirement for reporting them. There is a general sense that fewer burial sites are preserved in comparison with the other New England states (Daniel Cassedy, personal communication).

The VDHP intends to develop guidelines for the treatment of human skeletal remains encountered on Cultural Resource Management surveys and under the state's Land Use laws. Also, VDHP will study the need for amending the state cemetery laws.

The United States Forest Service (Region 9) holds and manages considerable tracts of land within Vermont. Recently, Region 8 of the USFS developed guidelines for the treatment, archaeological analysis and reburial of Indian skeletal remains located on USFS land (Schneider et al. 1988). These guidelines are under consideration in Region 9; David Lacy (USFS Green Mountain National Forest) recently held a conference of Vermont archaeologists and Abnaki Indians to comment on a burial action plan, which Lacy will discuss at the upcoming CNEA meeting.

Summary and Conclusions

As these summaries show, all New England states have laws designed to protect burial grounds. The laws are in addition to each state's archaeological statutes, and usually derive from non-archaeological concerns about the desecration of burial places. Burial protection statutes are among each state's strongest preservation statutes in that they extend to private land, usually include criminal penalties, and usually recommend in situ preservation.

Without exception, strengthened burial protection laws have resulted in strengthened state archaeological programs. Archaeologists and Native Americans work together toward the common goal of protecting burial places. This broadened constituency helps influence outcomes and also extends to historic preservation issues in general. Furthermore, developers are more likely to conduct archaeological surveys in advance of development, anticipating severe constraints if burials are located during construction.

Securing protection of burial places can be the first step towards improving legislation for the protection of other kinds of archaeological sites. A broadened constituency combined with the attention of legislators has established an important base to build on to improve the state programs responsible for preserving our dwindling archaeological heritage.

REFERENCES CITED

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

1988 Treatment of Human Remains and Grave Goods. <u>Policy Interpretation</u> <u>Memo randum 89-1</u>. Washington, D.C.

Anderson, Duane C., Michael Finnegan, John Hotopp and Alton D. Fisher

1978 The Lewis Central School Site: A Resolution of Ideological Conflicts. <u>Plains</u> <u>Anthropologist</u> 23:81.

Bowman, Margaret

1988 The Reburial of Native American Skeletal Remains: Approaches to the Resolution of a Conflict. <u>Harvard University</u> <u>Environmental Law Review</u>. U.S. Department of the Interior

1982 Guidelines for the Disposition of Archaeological and Historical Human Remains. Washington, D.C.

Massachusetts Historical Commission

n.d.a Guidelines for the Analysis of Human Skeletal Remains. Office of the Secretary of State, Boston.

Massachusetts Historical Commission

n.d.b What to Do When Human Burials Are Accidentally Uncovered. <u>Massachusetts Historical Commission Know-How</u>

 $\underline{#4}$, Office of the Secretary of State, Boston.

New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources

n.d. What to Do Upon Encountering Human Remains Before or During Land-Altering Activities in New Hampshire. NHDHR, Concord.

Poirier, David A., Nicholas Bellantoni and Mikki Aganstata

1985 Native American Burials in Connecticut: The Ethical, Scientific, and Bureaucratic Matrix. <u>Bulletin of the Archaeolog</u>. <u>ical Society of Connecticut</u> 48:3-12.

Quick, Polly McW. (editor)

1985 Proceedings of the Conference on Reburial Issues. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.

Rhode Island Historic Preservation Commission

1988 Guidelines for Indian Participation on Archaeological Surveys. RIHPC, Providence.

Robinson, Paul A. and Gail Gustafson

1982 A Partially Disturbed 17th Century Indian Burial in Rhode Island: Recovery, Preliminary Analysis and Protection. Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Connecticut 45: 41-50.

Rosen, Lawrence

1980 The Excavation of American Indian Burial Sites: A Problem in Law and Professional Responsibility, <u>American</u> <u>Anthropologist</u> 82: 5-27. Schneider, Kent A., Gordon Peters and Russell Kaldenberg
1988 USDA-FS Regional Policy on the Treatment of Human Remains. Paper presented at 53rd Annual Meeting of the
Society for American Archaeology, Phoenix.

Simon, Brona

1988 An Evaluation of the Results and Archaeological Benefits of the Implementation of the Unmarked Burial Law in

Massachusetts. Paper presented at 53rd Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Phoenix,

Talmage, Valerie A.

1982a The Violation of Sepulture: Is it Legal to Excavate Human Burials? <u>Ar-chaeology</u> 35(6): 44-49.

1982b Massachusetts General Laws and Human Burials. <u>Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society</u> 43(2): 60-65.

CURRENT RESEARCH BY TOPIC

RAMAH CHERT ARTIFACTS AND DEBITAGE FROM SITES IN NEW ENGLAND

Stephen Loring (University of South Carolina) is preparing a paper on the distribution of Ramah chert in New England, with tables and plates documenting all the known specimens in museum and private collections. Ramah chert, a fine-grained transparent quartzite (a cloudy gray to black color with black streaks, bands, or small spots) from northern Labrador, is found in New England assemblages in two distinct contexts:

1) a Late Archaic context, as long-stemmed projectile points and large bifaces (which come in either rectangular or semilunate, bipointed forms) found in mortuary deposits affiliated with the Moorehead Complex of mortuary sites in Maine and maritime Canada. To Steve's knowledge Ramah chert artifacts of Late Archaic context in New England are known only from ceremonial features. The Ramah chert artifacts from the Maine mortuary sites are identical to those recovered from the burials in Labrador. It appears that the Ramah chert artifacts were being manufactured in Labrador and transported south, where their sacred/ceremonial attributes were maintained.

2) In the Late Woodland/Ceramic Period context, either as debitage or as local projectile point and unifocal tool types manufactured from the exotic raw material. In this case it appears that Ramah chert arrived in New England primarily as unworked raw material which was transformed into local tool types. Broken tools and debitage of Ramah chert have been recovered at several sites along the Maine coast, in the forested river and lake district of northern Maine, and in the Champlain Valley. Two presumably Late Woodland/Ceramic Period caches of bifaces (one from the mouth of the Connecticut River, and one from Kegashka on the North Shore of the St. Lawrence) contain large lanceolate bifaces of Ramah chert. The bifaces are identical to specimens recovered from early Daniel Rattle complex components on the central Labrador coast that date to ca. 1800-1500 B.P.

Steve would welcome any references to specimens of Ramah chert, either as artifacts or debitage, that anyone might know about. At least two Vermont collectors acquired Ramah chert projectile points from the Moorehead complex cemetery at Old Town, from children who collected them during the WPA road construction. Other specimens might be scattered in private collections. Steve has documented large Ramah chert semilunar knives scattered in private collections. Steve has documented large Ramah chert semilunar knives from collections in the central and lower Connecticut River valley, in the Champlain Valley and in Rhode Island.

Steve would welcome the opportunity to examine specimens, or he would be willing to send comparative samples of Ramah chert debitage, to help facilitate identification. Please contact him at the Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208. For those unfamiliar with Ramah chert, the classic stemmed projectile points and large bifaces from the Late Archaic Moorehead complex sites are illustrated in Willoughby's <u>Antiquities of the New England Indians</u> (1935:Fig. 31, p.53) and Snow's <u>Archaeology of New England</u> (1980:Fig.5.12 and 5.13, p.210). Also see plates in William Fitzhugh's <u>Environmental Archaeology and Cultural Systems in Hamilton Inlet</u>, <u>Labrador</u>, Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology #16, 1972.

PALEOINDIAN STUDIES

Dena Dincauze (University of Massachusetts, Amherst) is preparing a review of fluted point finds, sites, and paleoenvironments east of the Mississippi for presentation at a seminar in Leningrad this summer. The seminar will inaugurate a Soviet-American exchange program for researchers in Palaeolithic and Paleoindian topics. The American coordinators of the program are Olga Soffer and George Frison. Details later.

PALEOENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES: ARCHAIC PERIOD

Dena Dincauze (University of Massachusetts, Amherst) reports that the reinvestigation of the Late Archaic Boylston Street "fish weirs" has reached the report writing stage. Many structures composed of upright sharpened stakes and horizontal piles of brush were built over a period of time (ca. 4700 B.P. to ca. 3500 B.P.) in the ancient Back Bay where the rising sea level was inundating an area of low hills and swampy lowlands. The discreteness and chronological separation of several of the units has been demonstrated, but their original sizes, shapes, and configurations have not been recovered. The new research has been no more successful than the original in finding evidence for the way the intertidal and subtidal structures were utilized to take fish or anything else. Whatever may have been going on, we are not required to imagine large labor forces or heroic coordination of workers among the local Late Archaic human populations on the basis of these structures. The period of construction and use of the features spans the time of apparent high population densities in the eastern coastal areas. The report on the Phase I construction at the 500 Boylston St. site will be prepared by Elena Decima, Dena Dincauze, and Michael Roberts. It will incorporate data from the field research and all the laboratory analyses prepared by the project consultants Catherine Carlson, Lawrence Kaplan, Paige Newby, Robin Rice, Peter Rosen, and others still peering and thinking.

PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT PATTERNS: LATE WOODLAND CONNECTICUT AND RHODE ISLAND

The Public Archaeology Survey Team, Inc. (PAST), at the University of Connecticut in Storrs, has been conducting a number of research projects under the direction of Kevin McBride. Data from these projects, funded by grants and contracts, have been studied within the context of PAST's ten-year study of regional settlement and subsistence patterns. This long-term study spans several diverse environmental zones and has resulted in the location of more than 500 sites; 100 of these sites have been radiocarbon dated, resulting in a very refined chronology of local prehistoric culture.

PAST has placed an emphasis on studying the change and continuation of aboriginal settlement and subsistence systems and on identifying distinct settlement systems associated through time with various environmental zones, including riverine (the lower Connecticut River Valley), coastal (southeastern Connecticut and Rhode Island), and interior (northeastern Connecticut and southwestern Rhode Island highlands). The most significant change PAST has noted in settlement patterns occurred around A.D. 500: a marked trend toward fewer but larger coastal sites (occupied for at least two seasons) at the same time as the adjacent interior areas show use on a more temporary basis (i.e., interior seasonal camps disappear, but small task-specific sites increase in number). This trend is associated with a decline in the rate of sea level rise and the establishment of tidal marshes and estuaries. In the interior upland areas of eastern Connecticut, the trend is not evident -- a dispersed settlement pattern continues, consisting of numerous seasonal and temporary camps.

The riverine situation is unclear, although UConn graduate student Jeffrey Bendremer's research suggests a possibly more-dispersed settlement pattern, involving more intensive maize horticulture by the 14th century.

A second major change in settlement patterns seems to have occurred sometime in the late 16th or early 17th century, when archaeological and ethnohistorical data suggest dispersed farmsteads as well as nucleated villages, associated with extensive cornfields. Fortified villages appear to be a post-European contact phenomena.

PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT PATTERNS: IROQUOIS COMPUTER GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Robert Hasenstab (University of Massachusetts, Amherst) has completed dissertation research on Late Woodland/European Contact period settlement in the Five-Nations Iroquois homeland of New York State. His data base includes a computer-based site file and a geographic information system (GIS) containing 50 environmental variables. These variables measure properties of soils, forests, climate, wetlands, and hydrography. Comparison of site locations with the random landscape -- through step-wise discriminant analysis -- shows two trends: the early-Late Woodland sites pattern with canoe-navigable waterways; and later sites, with agricultural soils. Comments from, or cooperation with, other settlement analyses are welcome.

PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT PATTERNS UPLAND INTERIOR

Suzanne Glover and Alan Leveillee of The PAL Inc. recently completed a site locational survey and site examination within the Cedar Swamp Archaeological District in Westborough, Massachusetts. Two spatially discrete prehistoric components were identified on a knoll bordered by the Cedar Swamp. One of these consisted of a Middle Archaic/Laurentian component. A refuse pit feature which contained charcoal, bone (deer and other mammals), and hazelnut fragments yielded a radiocarbon date of 5190 + /-70B.P. (Beta 28056). A Stark projectile point was discovered nearby. A Woodland component (Middle and Late) was identified at this site. Meadowood and Levanna projectile points were recovered in proximity to a burnt rock feature. Charcoal from this feature was radiocarbon dated to the Late Woodland period (570 + 50;Beta 28118). Charcoal from another feature in this vicinity yielded a radiocarbon date of 1700 + 80 (Beta 28119).

Both the Middle Archaic/Laurentian and the Woodland components at this site appear to represent seasonal camps. As the Cedar Swamp area has been used by prehistoric populations since the Early Archaic period, the exploitation of microenvironments within the swamp may have been part of settlement and subsistence practices within the larger Sudbury/Assabet and Charles River core areas.

15

PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT PATTERNS UPLAND INTERIOR: RIVERINE AREAS

Following the investigation of the Russell Cutlery in 1987, Michael S. Nassaney (University of Massachusetts, Amherst) has continued research on the history and prehistory of the industrial village of Turners Falls (Montague), Massachusetts. Two site locational surveys were completed last fall at the proposed sites of the Turners Falls State Heritage Park and the Turners Falls Industrial Park. The State Heritage Park will interpret the local history and prehistory as its theme. Therefore, background research for this project included a comprehensive synthesis of archaeological and historical resources for the town of Montague as well as adjacent portions of Greenfield and Gill.

Evidence of both prehistoric and historic land use patterns has been identified at the Heritage Park site. Industrial period archaeological and standing architectural remains of the Montague Paper Company (built in 1871) exist in the project area. The Montague Paper Company machine shop, a National Register property, will house the park's Visitors Center. The Farren House, also once known as the Grand Trunk Hotel, was another nineteenth century structure located in the study area. Little is known about the occupants of this building which was razed in the 1960s. Significant remains of the hotel may still exist beneath an asphalt parking lot associated with a commercial building. Archaeological evidence of outbuildings related to the hotel (e.g., carriage shed, blacksmith shop) have been identified, though they have suffered considerable twentieth century disturbance.

Numerous Indian "relics" were reported during the construction of the Farren House in the 1870s. Shovel test pits excavated near the carriage shed exposed evidence of a buried and apparently undisturbed scatter of quartzite chipping debris in association with a concentration of charcoal. More study is needed to determine the significance of this aboriginal site and establish its relationship to the site reported 100 m to the east beneath the Grand Trunk Hotel.

Further testing was conducted at the site of the Heritage Park boating facility located upriver from the waterfalls at Turners Falls. Despite backhoe excavations to a depth of 2 m, no sealed occupational surfaces could be identified. Considerable amounts of artificial fill, much of it probably from the excavation of the Turners Falls canal, was deposited along the river in this area in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The site of the proposed Turners Falls Industrial Park is located on the edge of the Montague Plain about 45 m above the elevation of the Connecticut River. A glacial kettle hole is located about 150 m southeast of the project area. More than 200 test pits excavated in the sensitive portions of this 26 hectare area. Despite the predicted high site potential for this area no significant concentrations of aboriginal or historical materials were found. During the historic period, the parcel was marginal to major transportation and communication routes in the region. Likewise, more optimal locations, perhaps in closer proximity to the great falls downstream on the Connecticut River, were probably selected for repeated occupation during the prehistoric period.

Analysis of data from the Eddy site, Amoskeag Falls, has been in progress during the winter of 1988-1989. This work has been conducted at Phillips Exeter Academy under the direction of Victoria Bunker with the assistance of Jane Potter and Patricia Hume. The objectives of this research included isolating discrete cultural components of Late Archaic and Ceramic age, completing an earlier study of an early Middle Archaic component, and consolidating cultural material from a disturbed area of the site to provide a comparative baseline.

Late Archaic occupations were defined by the distribution of diagnostic artifacts, as recognized by the shift from Merrimack to Brewerton bifaces. A major part of this analysis was directed toward an interpretation of the Ceramic Period. This was accomplished by examining soil stratigraphy, defining stone tool frequencies and diversities, and analyzing the distribution of pottery within a framework of radiocarbon dates.

On the basis of the discovery of Vinette I pottery in an early hearth feature -- dated 3315 +/- 90 B.P. (GX 12385) -- in stratigraphic contexts associated with Late Archaic bifaces (e.g., Brewerton, Small-stemmed and Atlantic) it is proposed that the "Woodland Period" be renamed the "Ceramic Period". It is inferred that at the Eddy site there was a gradual transition out of the Late Archaic through the introduction of pottery. Continuity is echoed in the use of chert, argillite, and volcanics for stone tool manufacture.

Macroscopically, the researchers have recognized diversity of stone tool material in debitage and complete tools. Among cherts and volcanics, they have noted a variety of colors and textures which may reflect diverse sources. The volcanics include Attleboro red felsite, Ossipee rhyolite, Saugus rhyolite, Kineo felsite, and other stone which generally can be attributed to the North Shore.

Pottery is homogeneous in style and technology. Late ceramics are poorly represented -- one sherd of incised, and a low frequency of stamped and corded wares. An overwhelming proportion of the sample is interior/exterior cordmarked Vinette 1. Cordage is uniformly "S" twist, suggesting cultural links with the interior reaches of the Merrimack Valley.

Materials recovered from a disturbed backhoe pit known as "Pit B", adjacent to the main excavation at Eddy, also have been studied. The researchers have assessed the utility of these materials from a disturbed context and recognized their usefulness in site interpretation. Point typology and the diversity in stone tool materials echo the excavated assemblage and provide limited data on horizontal distribution.

The question of direction and intensity of human interaction at the Eddy site at Amoskeag Falls is of particular interest for continuing research reflected in tool material, tool typology and function, and ceramic motifs. Work will continue and results will be formally presented as time permits.

PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT IN THE BERKSHIRE UPLANDS RELATIONSHIP OF GROUPS TO THE HUDSON VS. CONNECTICUT VALLEYS

During the summer of 1988, David J. Bernstein of the University of Massachusetts Archaeological Services (UMAS) conducted two site examinations in the Berkshire Hills of western Massachusetts. The project was sponsored by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works and the Federal Highway Administration. Both sites are located on the floodplain of the Housatonic River in Pittsfield. The Pontoosuc 2 site is a small campsite (approximately 10x10 m) dating to the Early Woodland period. Temporally diagnostic artifacts include thick-walled grit-tempered incised ceramics and a Meadowood projectile point. The only feature at the site is an ash deposit found in association with a quartz crystal.

The Woodleigh site is located on a terrace overlooking the Southwest Branch of the Housatonic River. Residential construction has destroyed much of the site, however it appears to have been originally at least 1,600 square meters in size. Numerous hearth features were found at the Woodleigh site and radiocarbon assays run on charcoal taken from two of them yielded C13 adjusted dates of $560 \pm \frac{1}{-}60$ BP (Beta-26966) and $3190 \pm \frac{1}{-}330$ B.P. (Beta-26967). No ceramics were recovered and the only temporally diagnostic artifact is a Normanskill projectile point.

Preliminary results from the two site examinations and from a site locational survey reported in 1987 by Leslie C. Shaw, Ellen-Rose Savulis, Mitchell T. Mulholland, and George P. Nicholas (UMASS Archaeological Services) have implications for the study of the relationship of sites and peoples in the Berkshire uplands to those in neighboring regions. Though prehistoric occupation of the Berkshires dates back at least to the Middle or Late Archaic periods, sites here were no less frequent than those to the east (Connecticut River Valley), west (Hudson River Valley), and south (lower Housatonic River Valley). Sites appear smaller than those seen in the major river valleys and artifact densities may be somewhat lighter than those reported to the east and west. This does not imply necessarily that the uplands were used only on a seasonal basis or for only a small range of activities (e.g., hunting). Though much more work needs to be done to address this issue, it may be the case that the uplands merely supported a smaller resident population than those associated with the lowlands.

Lithic materials recovered during the site examinations and those observed in local collections generally show greater similarity to those typical of the Hudson River Valley and New York State than to materials from the east (e.g., the Connecticut River Valley). Superficially, the source of much of the lithic raw material seems to be to the west in New

York. Projectile point styles also suggest a westward focus, as do the limited historical sources. It is hoped that in the future the study of lithic sources can be used to help trace the movement of people and raw materials.

HISTORIC AND PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT UPLAND HILLTOWNS - "MARGINAL AREAS"

In 1988-1989, Richard D. Holmes of UMAS conducted an archaeological site locational survey for a proposed highway reconstruction project along Route 143 in the towns of Chesterfield and Worthington, Hampshire County, Massachusetts. The area is located in two hilltowns along the Westfield River (elevation approximately 460 m). No previous professional survey had been conducted in the vicinity of the project area. Several research questions addressed during the project concerned the settlement patterns in prehistory and history in the uplands of the Connecticut River Valley. Was this upland area occupied on a regular basis by prehistoric peoples? Similarly what can be learned from the archaeological record about historic settlement of a region which was far removed from the Connecticut River, and was less desirable, both economically and agriculturally, than the towns closer to the river and to markets?

The survey indicated that prehistoric people did occupy the area, but with small, taskoriented camp sites. No evidence of larger occupation sites was encountered. The survey recovered prehistoric quartz and quartzite flakes on a small terrace near the West Branch of the Westfield River; a small mortar, found by a local resident among the cobbles of a small stream was also recorded. In both cases, the findspots were evidently disturbed by past road construction. These artifacts are the only evidence, thus far, of prehistoric use in this upland area.

Two historic sites -- cellar holes and dry stone foundations -- were also recorded: one in West Chesterfield, near a nineteenth-century industrial area: the other in Worthington. The Worthington site may be associated with one of the earliest settlers in the town, Nehemiah Prouty. This site is located far from the earliest recorded road in Worthington and seems unusually isolated from any other settlement. Both historic sites yielded artifacts dating from the eighteenth century to the present, which is consistent with our expectations. The research potential for the Worthington site is significant in that we could learn about life of the earliest Euro-American settlers of the uplands of interior New England. While the sites will not be impacted by the proposed highway project, recommendations are being made to the local historical commissions to protect them from the threat of future development.

PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT PATTERNS LOWLAND RIVERINE ENVIRONMENTS

Data recovery investigations have been completed by Elizabeth Holstein and Deborah Cox of PAL on the Bassett Knoll site in Raynham, Massachusetts. This site is located approximately 3 km from the Taunton River on a terrace adjacent to a small, freshwater brook. More than 200 projectile points, which date from the Middle Archaic through the Late Woodland periods, have been retrieved from this site. In addition to the points, chipping debris, bifaces, scrapers, drills, large quantities of aboriginal pottery, fragments of an atlatl weight, and a grooved pebble have been recovered. More than 50 features, including storage pits, hearths and post molds, as well as a cache pit filled with clay, have been located. A single Native American burial has also been identified.

The density of artifacts and features is evidence for intensive occupation of this site during the prehistoric period. Few sites in southeastern New England contain this much raw data concerning prehistoric settlement and subsistence practices. This site also has the potential to contain features associated with the manufacture of aboriginal ceramic vessels. In addition, the large number of Squibnocket Stemmed projectile points which occur at this site can yield important information regarding the stylistic attributes and the chronological affiliations of these points.

In Haverhill, Massachusetts a recent intensive level survey by Suzanne Glover and Alan Leveillee of The PAL Inc. yielded a small, single component site in proximity to a wetland within the Merrimac River drainage. This site encompassed approximately 200 square meters and contained a low density scatter of felsite, rhyolite, quartz, and quartzite chipping debris. A Mansion Inn implement blade affiliated with the Susquehanna tradition was also recovered. This single component site is potentially significant because it represents one facet of the seasonal round of Susquehanna tradition groups settled in the Merrimac River valley.

Several additional locational surveys have been conducted by staff of The PAL Inc. within the Concord, Sudbury and Assabet River drainages. Surveys by Duncan Ritchie, Denise Mowchan, Elizabeth Holstein, and Suzanne Glover have been conducted in the towns of Wayland, Concord, Carlisle, Bedford, and Ashland. These surveys yielded low density lithic scatters, but lacked evidence for multiple activities or long-term utilization.

PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT PATTERNS: COASTAL ZONE FRENCHMAN BAY, MAINE

Last summer the Abbe Museum, Bar Harbor, Maine, and the Center for Northern Studies, Wolcott, Vermont, completed the third year of their on-going site survey of the Frenchman-Blue Hill Bay area. During the survey, conducted by Diane Kopec and Thomas Lowell, 20 recently discovered sites were recorded and one collection was examined and photographed.

The collection, belonging to Nathan Smallidge of Northeast Harbor, is from six sites, four of which are known sites located on Mount Desert Island. Artifacts from the two inland sites, Spring River and Donnell Pond, include a felsite Stark-like point dating the Middle Archaic period.

Site testing was conducted by Dr. Steven Cox and students from the Center for Northern Studies. While all four sites were productive, two of them -- located on Great Gott and Great Cranberry Islands -- have excellent potential for future work and are being nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. Together these two sites produced a biface mid-section, a small unifacial point, dentate rocker-stamped and cord-wrapped stick pottery, a shell bead, flint, pipe stems, abundant flakes and faunal remains. In addition, a local resident donated a serrated copper pendant from the Great Gott Island site to the Museum. Ruth Moore, novelist and Bass Harbor resident, also has a large collection from this site which was examined in 1985. Her collection, which includes a Late Archaic ochre-stained woodworking tool fragment is mostly of Ceramic period objects.

These surveys, along with the upcoming 1989 surveys, are funded through grants from the Department of the Interior through the Maine Historic Preservation Commission.

PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT PATTERNS COASTAL AND ISLAND AREAS

In 1988, archaeological investigations conducted by The PAL Inc. focussed on the Inner Cape and the Narragansett Bay coastal zone. Intensive archaeological surveys conducted by Ann Davin, MaryLynne Rainey, and Denise Mowchan in the towns of Mashpee, Barnstable, Falmouth, and Bourne, located a number of small prehistoric sites in close proximity to freshwater wetlands and kettle hole ponds. Most of these sites contained low densities of chipping debris, but lacked evidence for multiple activities or long-term use. One exception, the Hathaway Pond site in Barnstable, contained evidence for multiple occupations spanning several thousand years. This site was originally located in a survey by MaryLynne Rainey and Ann Davin and was subsequently studied by them at the site examination level. Projectile points from all but the Early Archaic and Early Woodland periods were found at this site. An Eden point, from the end of the PaleoIndian period, represents the oldest artifact ever recovered at an archaeological site on Cape Cod. A pipe bowl fragment made of finely tempered aboriginal ceramic was also discovered on this site. The stylistic attributes of this artifact are suggestive of Iroquoian influence or manufacture.

The Hathaway Pond site provides further evidence for the utilization of kettle hole ponds and freshwater resources on the Inner Cape throughout the prehistoric period.

In the town of Fairhaven, two sites along the Nasketucket River were located by De-

nise Mowchan and Ann Davin, and subsequently studied by them at the site examination level. The Nasketucket River site encompassed approximately 18,000 square meters and contained low to moderate densities of chipping debris, several bifaces, lenses of shell, bone fragments, and a Madison-like projectile point.

The Sconticut Neck site yielded assorted low densities of chipping debris, two shellmidden features, and a greasy black soil layer interpreted as a possible living floor. The features contained both aboriginal and eighteenth century ceramics, chipping debris, and shell, as well as deer, fish, and bird bones. Although a shallow plow zone was present, historic materials were not distributed as field trash, but were found only in the features. Recovered historic materials consisted of delftware (ca. 1610-1780), combed redware (ca. 1670-1795), and kaolin pipe bowl and stem fragments with manufacturing dates ranging from 1680 to 1800. A radiocarbon date of 290 + /-80B.P. (Beta 28768) was obtained on shell from one of the features.

The close association of Colonial and aboriginal materials suggests this site may represent a historic eighteenth century Native American occupation. The lack of structural materials (i.e., brick, nails, window glass), the presence of strictly utilitarian ceramic types, the presence of wild -- rather than domestic -- animal remains, and the peripheral location of this site support this interpretation. Although historic documents record the presence of Native Americans on Sconticut Neck during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, this is the first site of this type to be located in the area.

Archaeological data recovery investigations by Alan Leveillee and Renee Van Couyghen along the Rhode Island coastal zone have defined two sites in North Kingston. The Southwind and Hoskins Park sites, located on a terrace above an estuarine environment, contained evidence of 10,000 years of prehistoric land use. These sites were visited sporadically for short-term periods and appear to be associated with specific resource-extraction activities. The Late Woodland components of these sites may represent slightly longer occupations. It is interesting to note that, according to the archaeological record, Native American use of this area during the European Contact Period remained similar to that during the previous periods.

A different type of site in North Kingstown has recently undergone a site examination by Renee VanCouyghen and Deborah Cox. The ER site consists of a fairly long-term occupation campsite dating to the Middle and Late Woodland periods. This site contained lithic quartz workshops, discrete areas where processing of faunal remains occurred, evidence for processing lithics (e.g., scrapers, drills, ground stone spalls), as well as storage or refuse pit features. In addition, a textile fragment was recovered at this site. An unusual aspect of this site is that a portion of the cultural material was recovered from saturated soil contexts. This saturation occurred as a result of historic period alteration of the landscape. This is an important consideration for archaeologists when preparing research designs for areas subject to historic modification.

Partially completed data recovery investigations on Aquidneck Island, conducted by

Denise Mowchan and Ann Davin, have defined several components at the Eastover site. Numerous Middle Archaic period Neville and Stark points have been discovered at this coastal location along the Sakonnet River in Rhode Island. A handful of projectile points dating to the Early, Late, and Terminal Archaic periods have also been located. A Kirk point, found at this site, represents the only existing evidence for an Early Archaic period presence on Aquidneck Island. A cluster of pit and hearth features, some containing shell, are believed to be associated with the Late Woodland period. A radiocarbon date of 730 + /-90 B.P. (Beta 29304) was obtained on shell from a pit feature containing aboriginal ceramics.

Presently, the depositions at the Eastover site indicate intensive utilization of this location during the Middle Archaic period when the Sakonnet was a freshwater river, and during the Late Woodland period, when an estuarine environment was present. Although estuarine resources are believed to have been available in this area by around 4000 B.P., until now no evidence for Late and Terminal Archaic period utilization of these resources has been located at this site. Further excavations will focus on the issue of differential utilization of the Eastover site through time.

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH: NANTUCKET

Elizabeth Little's (Nantucket Historical Association) research this past year has centered on the location of the Late Woodland and Historic period Indian villages at Nantucket, from both historical and archaeological vantage points (Little 1988b, c and d). This has been stimulated in part by the discovery and preservation of an historic Christian Indian burial ground at Nantucket, and the associated UMASS Archaeological Services/Massachusetts Historical Commission joint archaeological project conducted by Catherine Carlson (UMAS) and Brona Simon (MHC), for which Betty was project historian.

Otherwise Betty is still busy as a curator of prehistoric artifacts, and chair of the Archaeological Committee at the Nantucket Historical Association, and as editor of the <u>Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society</u>. In the latter role, she always welcomes jargon-free, crisp articles of scientific or general interest to the archaeological community.

CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: NEW HAMPSHIRE

The 1989 summer field season offers the opportunity to explore archaeological resources in several important areas of New Hampshire. Victoria Bunker has been awarded several contracts to conduct Phase I and II research for proposed construction projects. Jane Potter will serve as field and research assistant and Lynne Monroe will serve as architectural historian on these projects. One project includes Phase II sampling along a proposed Tennessee Gas Company pipeline corridor on the east bank of the Merrimack River in Pembroke, New Hampshire. Phase I study identified the location of three prehistoric sites and one historic site. The prehistoric sites are situated on river terraces near the confluence of the Suncook and Merrimack Rivers. The historic site is a late nineteenth century brickyard situated on an upper terrace where naturally occurring clay provided a ready material for brick manufacture. The survey will define the age, size, and context for these sites.

The second project is a Phase I sensitivity assessment for the proposed I-393 highway in east-central New Hampshire. The route will link the city of Concord with the sea coast, and will bypass Route 4. The study area includes a 10 x 30 mile reach, intersecting 21 USGS quadrangles. The study will identify archaeological site sensitivity from a variety of data including settlement pattern, topography, and other environmental variables. Significant standing structures will also be identified. This study is particularly important because it will focus on an area of the state which has not been studied previously and is experiencing rapid growth. Because both coastal river systems and the Merrimack Valley are included in the study area, inferences can be drawn on distinctive settlement patterns.

Other studies have been completed recently for the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT). These include walkover surveys of two highway corridors in southwestern New Hampshire. Continued survey for one alternate route in Dublin-Harrisville was completed to determine the potential for the presence of prehistoric sites. Because of environmental factors, no potential was assigned. A survey was also completed for prehistoric site sensitivity in the towns of Nelson and Stoddard. One potential location was recognized near a stream and wetland. Mapping of historic sites on farmsteads and mills was also completed for these projects.

Curation of artifacts from NH21-16, a prehistoric site located in Effingham, has been undertaken for NHDOT. The site was recognized in a proposed bridge replacement alignment over the Ossipee River. Argillite debitage in discrete workshops was recovered during the Phase I and II survey. The site exhibits contextual integrity and reflects horizontal stratification associated with stone tool maintenance and manufacture. The future of archaeological study at NH21-16 remains undecided, pending highway design processes.

Finally, a prehistoric site was discovered within a proposed highway access ramp on Route I-293 in Bedford, New Hampshire. The site has been named the Bedford Boulder site, NH45-115. The site is situated on an elevated terrace on the west bank of the Merrimack River in the shelter of a large boulder. Material recovered from the site consisted of 98 quartz flakes, chips and bits of shatter, representing a small lithic workshop beside a prominent boulder. While the age of the site is unknown, it is interpreted as a single-activity locus corresponding to a single point in time.

A preliminary study of archaeological site potential was completed for the city of Manchester on property where construction of a YMCA outdoor recreation facility is proposed. The area studied includes 40 acres of open land within the Manchester urban area, which was used historically for agricultural purposes. The location, on the east bank of the Merrimack River, north of the Amoskeag Falls, has high prehistoric site potential. It is characterized by level, well-drained terraces dissected by streams and a wetland. The location is of interest as one of few remaining large tracts of open land on the Merrimack River within one of New Hampshire's largest communities.

Mapping for Phase I archaeological and architectural sensitivity has been undertaken for the proposed Route 101A highway bypass in towns west of the city of Nashua. Sensitive areas were mapped along the Souhegan River and vicinity based on environmental and historical data. Of particular interest is the role of small streams, wetlands and springs for prehistoric settlement and abandoned historic community centers.

FIELD SCHOOLS

Old Sturbridge Village will hold its first annual Summer Field School in Architectural History from June 26 to August 11, 1989. The program, focusing on buildings of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in rural Central Massachusetts, will feature intensive instruction and experience in the techniques of architectural documentation including: measuring and drawing buildings, architectural photography, and a thorough introduction to documentary research. Guest lecturers from numerous disciplines will make presentations on current methods in the study of architecture and New England history.

The Field School in Architectural History will be held in conjunction with the eleventh annual Old Sturbridge Village SummerField School in Historical Archaeology. The second season of archaeological excavation at the house and shop site of the early nineteenth century cabinetmaker/housewright James Clark of West Brookfield, Massachusetts, will be complemented by the documentation of buildings in West Brookfield and the surrounding towns, several of which were erected by Clark. Students in both field schools will be given many opportunities to interact with their counterparts and will be encouraged to explore and integrate the methods and findings of the other groups.

Negotiations are currently underway with Clark University of Worcester, Massachusetts to grant both undergraduate and graduate course credits to field school participants. Enrollment is limited to twenty students. For further information and an application contact: Myron O. Stachiw or Nora Pat Small, Research Department, Old Sturbridge Village, 1 Old Sturbridge Village Road, Sturbridge, MA 01566, or call (508) 347-3362.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PUBLICATIONS

Richard D. Holmes and Mitchell T. Mulholland

1988Archaeological Locational Survey of the Proposed Route 143 Reconstruction Project, Worthington and Chesterfield, Massachusetts. Prepared for the Massachusetts Department of Public Works. UMASS Archaeological Services, Amherst.

Elizabeth Little

1988 a Nantucket Whaling in the Early 18th Century. In <u>Papers of the Nineteenth</u> <u>Algonquin Conference</u>, edited by William Cowan, pp. 111-131. Carleton University, Ottawa.

1988b Where are the Woodland Villages on Cape Cod and the Islands? Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society 49:72-82.

1988c The Indian Sickness at Nantucket 1763-1764 Nantucket Algonquian Studies No. 11. Nantucket Historical Association, Nantucket, MA.

1988d History of the Town of Miacomet. Nantucket Algonquian Studies No. 12. Nantucket Historical Association, Nantuck et, MA.

CONFERENCE ON NEW ENGLAND ARCHAEOLOGY

TREASURER'S REPORT

Beginning Balance	5/1/86		\$1185.04
	5/1/86- 12/31/86	1/1/87- 12/31/87	1/1/88- 12/31/88
Revenue			
Membership Dues	210.00	1165.50*	1191.90*
Expenses			
Postage	11.00	73.22	105.26
Misc. Supplies		6.64	65.44
Typing	30.00	35.00	
Misc. Copying		307.05	-
Meetings	100.00	65.50	
Newsletters	661.50 (Vol. 6a)	310.95 (Vol. 6b)	279.00 (Vol. 7a)
		200.00 (Vol. 7b)	
Bank Charges	28.21	46.42	26.72
Ending Balance	12/31/88		\$1559.03

*(+ Conference Registration)

٠



Figure 152. Textiles from Graves. a, b, c, Woven bulrush matting: a, Harpswell, Me.; b, Winthrop, Mass.; c, Fall River, Mass. d, Fragment of coiled netting bag, Winthrop; e, same as d, enlarged; f, fringe of bast or other fiber, Winthrop; g, sewed bulrush matting, Harpswell, Me. All Peabody Museum, Cambridge except c. (1/1, except e.)

From: Willoughby, C.C., Antiquities of the New England Indians. Peabody Nuseum of Harvard University, Cambridge. 1935:245.

CONFERENCE ON NEW ENGLAND ARCHAEOLOGY CURRENT RESEARCH

Please submit a brief paragraph on your current New England Archaeological research for inclusion in the next CNEA Newsletter. Also submit any new bibliographic titles for books, articles, reports, etc. in <u>American Antiquity</u> format. Thank you.

Please return by June 1, 1989 to: Mitchell Mulholland UMASS Archaeological Services University of Massachusetts Blaisdell House Amherst, MA 01003

or to your local CNEA Steering Committee representative. If possible send your contribution on a computer diskette (with paper copy) on IBM or compatible format, McIntosh, or Kaypro. Please specify the computer model, word processor operating system used to create your file. Your diskette will be returned to you. Begin with a paragraph, or at least a few sentences stating what your research topic is, and how your data are used to answer your research questions.

Name

Institution

Mailing Address

Bibliographic entry

Research Research topic

Current research

C14 dates: See reverse.

PLEASE MAIL AS SOON AS POSSIBLE

RADIOCARBON DATES

Please report C14 dates as fully as possible.

Date +/- B.P.

Laboratory: Lab number:

Institution responsible for the excavation:

Principal Investigator(s) or archaeologist responsible for the excavation:

Name of Site:

Town:

USGS Quad: State:

Medium (e.g., charcoal, shell, bone, etc.):

Describe feature or object that was dated:

Diagnostic (temporal or cultural) artifacts <u>directly</u> associated with the date:

Bibliographic references:

.

"

NOTE: Please provide the above information even if the date is included in the text.